

INFORMATION LETTER

Not for
Publication

NATIONAL CANNERS ASSOCIATION

For Members
Only

No. 628

Washington, D. C.

November 21, 1936

OLD-AGE BENEFIT TAXES

Analyses of Regulations Issued by the Bureau of Internal Revenue

On November 5, 1936, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue issued Regulations 91 interpreting and applying the provisions of Title VIII of the Social Security Act which levy taxes in connection with the Federal program of Old-Age Benefits. As was pointed out in the last issue of the INFORMATION LETTER these taxes become effective January 1, 1937, and are imposed on both employers and employees, and the employer is made responsible for the collection and payment of the employee's contributions. The necessity for notification to employees of the deductions from their wages has already been emphasized. The rate for 1937 is in each case 1% of the wages paid or received, excluding wages in excess of \$3,000 paid to any one person. The taxes are distinct from and in addition to the taxes imposed on employers of eight or more in connection with the unemployment compensation portions of the Act, and in contrast apply to every canner who employs one or more persons.

Pursuant to its announced policy of keeping its members informed of all developments in this field the Association is mailing a copy of these Regulations to each member, and in this and subsequent issues of the INFORMATION LETTER an attempt will be made to analyze them and point out those portions which are of peculiar interest to the canning industry.

What canners are subject to the Act?

Every canner who employs one or more persons anywhere within the United States, Alaska or Hawaii is an employer subject to the Act. Art. 4 of the Regulations points out that "every person is an employer who employs one or more individuals in an employment * * * not specifically excepted." The number employed, whether one or five hundred, is immaterial, as is the length of time during which an individual may be employed. Thus if the canner employs one person for one day he is an employer within the meaning of the Act, and the seasonal nature of the canning industry affords no basis for claiming an exemption.

It is also unimportant whether the canner is a corporation, a partnership, an unincorporated association, or merely an individual. The Act applies to each with equal force. Nor is the operation of the Act limited to canners engaged in interstate commerce. It applies to all without distinction as to the local or interstate character of their business.

Members are urged to preserve for reference the copy of Regulations 91 mailed by the Association to the head office of each member firm. Additional copies are available from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., at 10 cents each.

Furthermore, there is nothing in the Act or Regulations which indicates an intent to exempt the canning industry. Certain employees are excepted when their services fall within a particular occupational class (such as agricultural and marine labor, etc., discussed below), but the employer is not exempted unless he can show that all of his employees fall within the excepted classes.

It thus appears that the Act has a very general application to the entire canning industry, and every canner should carefully study the Regulations to determine the exact extent to which his operations will be affected.

Who are employees?

The above discussion indicates that the operation of the Act is predicated upon the employer-employee relationship. In order to determine whether a canner employs one or more persons who are not excepted, and to ascertain which of the individuals performing service for him are "employees" upon whose wages a tax must be paid, it is necessary to first determine who are "employees" within the meaning of the Act.

Under Articles 2 and 3 of the Regulations every individual who performs services for a canner is an "employee" if three conditions are met.

First: The services must be performed within the United States, Alaska, or Hawaii. If performed wholly outside these territorial limits the individual is not an employee. The place where the contract of employment is entered into and the citizenship or residence of the employer and employee are immaterial. The sole test is where the services are performed.

(Continued on page 5102)

CONVENTION ROOM RESERVATIONS

Members Who Have Not Filed Requests Urged to Do So Promptly

Many members of the Association have already sent in their requests for room reservations for the annual convention to be held at Chicago the week of January 25th. With a large attendance in prospect, those members who have not yet filed their requests are urged to get them in promptly in order that the Association may, as nearly as possible, provide for the kind of reservations desired.

Requests for reservations should state specifically:

1. Name and address of applicant.
2. How many and type of rooms desired, and at which hotel in Chicago.
3. Name and official position or connection of each individual who will occupy the rooms requested.
4. Time when rooms are desired for occupancy.

OLD-AGE BENEFIT TAXES

(Continued from page 5101)

Second: The legal relationship of employer and employee must exist between the canner and the person performing the services. The tests applied in determining whether this relationship is present are quite similar to those used under Workmen's Compensation Acts. These are:

1. Does the canner have the right to direct and control the manner in which the services are performed?
2. Does the canner have the right to discharge the individual?
3. Does the canner pay his wages?

If these factors are present the individual is an employee within the meaning of the Act. If they are not he is an "independent contractor" and is not covered.

Applying these tests to typical cannery labor it is readily seen that the majority of the workers are covered. Cleaners, sorters, fillers, process men, cooks, labelling and shipping workers, machinists, watchmen, maintenance crews, power house help, common labor, and the like are all employees. The method of compensation is immaterial and workers paid by the piece rather than by the hour are equally employees. Nor is the length of service of any importance. A transient laborer who may only work a day or two is included, as are women who work only part-time for a few hours a day.

Truck drivers would also be classed as canner's employees unless it could be shown that they were employees, not of the canner, but of the farmer, and that the farmer paid their wages. In some few instances it may be possible to secure an exemption for truck drivers if it can be shown that they own their own trucks and are in reality in business for themselves, and that they perform general trucking services for various people under contract. In such cases the truck driver would be considered an independent contractor.

This distinction between an employee and an independent contractor is important, moreover, in connection with the persons utilized in selling and distributing the canner's products. A broker who sells on commission, handles several lines, and sells for several different canners, is not usually deemed an employee of any canner. Similarly, a salesman who works on a commission basis, and is not in any way subject to the direction or control of the canner as to the methods he utilizes in selling, the hours he works, the territory in which he solicits, etc., is not an employee. On the other hand, a salesman who works on a salary basis for only one canner would usually be classified as an employee subject to the Act. Where borderline cases arise the better policy would be to treat such doubtful salesmen as employees unless it can clearly be demonstrated that they are not, and to make the required deductions from their wages. This is undoubtedly the policy which will be adopted by the Bureau of Internal Revenue in administering the Act.

This distinction is also of importance in the case of the fisherman employed in connection with fish packing enterprises. Where the fishermen work on a share basis receiving a portion of the proceeds of the catch in return for their activities it may be possible to contend that they are not employees, but partners in an independent fishing enterprise. Under these circumstances, the exempted nature of the services is not affected by the fact that the canner owns the boat, or purchases the entire catch. If, however, the canner

owns the boat, houses the fishermen, directs their fishing activities, and pays them so much per fish, the men are employees, and taxes must be paid on their wages.

The Act and Regulations make no distinction between managerial and supervisory employees and common labor. An officer of a corporation receiving a large salary is as much of an employee as a laborer in the cannery. The directors of a corporation, as such, are not employees. If, however, they are also officers or perform other services they may be covered by the Act.

Third: The third condition necessary to classing a worker as an "employee" under the Act is that his services do not fall within any of the exempted classes. The Act and Regulations enumerate certain classes of employment which are exempt from the operation of the Act. Unless the services of the worker fall within one of the exemptions he is an employee subject to the Act.

What employees are exempted?

Articles 5 through 13 of the Regulations deal with the exempted employments. At the outset it should be noted that these exemptions attach only to the services performed by the employee and not to the employee himself (Art. 5). Thus if an employee during the course of the year (or at the same time) performs several different services, some of which are exempt and some not, he is excepted from the Act only as to his exempt services. The wages he receives from the other services not exempt would be subject to the taxes. This distinction has several important applications to the canning industry which will be pointed out in connection with the following discussion of the exemptions.

Agricultural Labor: The definition of "agricultural labor" promulgated by Art. 6 of the Regulations is identical with that previously adopted in connection with the unemployment compensation portions of the Act. It was reported at p. 4892 of the INFORMATION LETTER of March 28, 1936, and need not here be repeated. Under it the exemption is limited solely to services actually performed on a farm in connection with the growing or harvesting of crops. Employees engaged in packing, processing, canning or transporting the farm products are exempt only when such services are performed for the owner or tenant of the farm, and then only if the processing activities are carried on only as an incident to the ordinary farming operations and not on a commercial scale. Obviously, typical cannery employees are not exempted by this definition. In cases where an employee works part of the time on the farm in connection with the growing of the crops and the remainder of the time in the cannery, only that portion of his services performed directly on the farm would be exempt. Taxes would have to be paid with respect to the remainder. Here again where borderline cases arise the canner should pursue a policy of treating the worker as an employee and making the deductions from his wages until his exact status can be determined.

Casual labor not in the course of employer's business: The Act also exempts "casual labor not in the course of the employer's trade or business." Some canners have misapprehended this exception and thought that it would exempt to a large extent transient and seasonal labor. Such a construction is not correct. For the definition which has been adopted in Art. 8 of the Regulations provides that only that "labor which is occasional, incidental, or irregular, and does not promote or advance the employer's trade or

business is excepted." Furthermore, "casual labor performed for a corporation does not come within this exception." The transient labor which is employed in canneries may be occasional, incidental, and irregular, *but it usually does promote and advance the canner's business*, and hence is probably not excepted. In addition, such labor is in most cases performed for a corporation.

Officers and members of crews: The old-age benefits portions of the Act, as do the unemployment compensation sections, exempt the officers and members of the crews of vessels. The Regulations (Art. 10) define this to mean "the master or officer in charge of the vessel, however designated, and every individual, subject to his authority, serving on board and contributing in any way to the operation and welfare of the vessel." In cases where an employee works part of the time as a member of the crew of a vessel, and part of the time as a longshoreman or in a cannery, as is sometimes the case in connection with salmon packing, only that portion of his services performed on the vessel are exempt. The wages paid with respect to the remainder are taxable.

It should be noted that this exemption extends only to crews of vessels "documented under the laws of the United States or of any foreign country." This means that the vessel must be registered, enrolled or licensed in conformity with law. This is in contrast to the exemption of marine labor contained in the unemployment compensation portions of the Act which extend to all vessels "on the navigable waters of the United States" irrespective of whether they are documented or not. See INFORMATION LETTER of March 28, 1936, at p. 4893.

Employees who have attained age 65: Under the Act and Art. 9 of the Regulations, all services performed by an employee who is 65 years or older are exempt. This includes all services performed on or after the day preceding the employee's 65th birthday.

Domestic servants, government employees, and employees of religious, charitable, and educational organizations are also exempt.

After the canner has ascertained which of his employees are subject to the Act and which are exempted, the next step is to ascertain the rate of the tax, and the wages which are subject to it. These will be discussed in the next issue of the INFORMATION LETTER.

CROP INSURANCE

Start With One Crop Is Suggested by the Secretary of Agriculture

That crop insurance might well begin with only one crop—perhaps wheat, Secretary of Agriculture Wallace stated in an address at the annual meeting of the Land Grant College Association on November 16th. Producers of wheat, he added, appear to be the most eager to have it tried.

Discussion of the crop insurance problem formed a considerable part of the address, and because of the interest of canners in the subject, the following excerpts from the Secretary's address are reproduced:

"The crop insurance idea does not represent a new field of thought. It has been talked about among farmers and in Congress for a long time. The Department of Agriculture

has been studying it in one way and another for fifteen years. Small experiments in writing all-risk crop insurance have been made from time to time by private companies since 1899. Now it appears probable that we are coming up to the point of real action in this field. Consequently the need for constructive thought and for cooperation, especially on the part of people in the educational field, becomes urgent. Representatives of the old line insurance companies, of warehouse interests, and of farmers recently have met with us in Washington and have assured us of a practical cooperation which is going to have a very real importance in the operations of any plan which may be worked out.

"As I have said before, there is no disposition to rush into any half-baked scheme along this line. The committee appointed by the President to report relative to possible legislation on crop insurance has not contemplated action on more than one or two crops at first. We have been exploring the possibilities in the case of wheat, corn and cotton but I think it is the feeling of all who are close to the subject that the wise thing is to start slowly with an experimental underaking in one or two crops.

"The Department has for some time been making a detailed study of the millions of individual farm records which have come to us through the A.A.A. program. It goes without saying that the actuarial problem is the first great thing to be met before we can make a practical start in crop insurance. One of the stumbling blocks for private companies has always been the lack of any adequate background of individual farm data, over a period of years, which would furnish a working basis from which to calculate either premiums or losses. The records which we have obtained as a result of the A.A.A. program furnish a considerable body of such data for the first time.

"One respect in which the position of the Government is different from that of the private insurance companies is that the Government can more readily take payments in kind. This, I believe, is a very important consideration. When a private company writes an insurance contract to indemnify a farmer for a given amount of money loss, it assumes the risk not only of physical loss of the crop but of price fluctuations as well. By building a system of payments in kind we would fairly well eliminate the price factor. The price problem is a question by itself. Moreover, as I have many times said, I believe there are very great possibilities both for producers and consumers in the stabilization of supplies through a system which would store food products in time of plenty to be available in time of want.

"I might sketch for you very briefly some of the things that the Department's study of crop insurance has brought to the forefront. The idea would be to set up all-risk insurance covering a certain percentage of average yields, as figured over a period of years. It would be wholly optional with farmers whether they wished to come into the plan. The premiums on a given farm would be based, let us say, upon the loss experience on that farm as shown over a period of years, the figure for the individual farm to be adjusted by using the loss experience of the county as an adjusting factor.

"At least four definite problems arise in this consideration of a system of crop insurance with payments in kind. First, there is the problem of determining loss rates and premiums rates. Second, there is the problem of collecting and assembling such premium payments made in kind. Third, naturally the question of storage at once arises; where and how shall the quantities of crops so collected be stored? Fourth, there is the question of the disposition of the stored product; should losses be paid directly out of it or should it be sold and the proceeds distributed in dollars equivalent to the product? If some of the stored product is sold, should there be a policy of replacement by purchases in the market so as to maintain the reserves?

"As one alternative, possibly the farmer might pay premiums in cash equivalent and then the Government might convert this cash into the physical commodity and store the latter. The payment of losses also might be made in various ways. The farmer might be paid in kind; or possibly he might be given a warehouse receipt; or perhaps he might be given an option on the given quantity of stored product due him which he could liquidate and receive a check therefor.

"A possibility bearing upon the point I mentioned a moment ago of storage in years of plenty, is that farmers might pay their premiums only in years of good crops. That is to say, when a man had a bad year and a poor crop, he would make no premium payment that year but in a season of good crop he would pay premiums not only for the good year but for the bad ones also. Thus, if the premium on a certain farm for wheat insurance happened to be half bushel per acre per year, the farmer would pay two and one-half bushels per acre over a period of five years, but he might make this two-and-one-half bushel payment out of the crops of two seasons or three seasons, say, rather than out of the crops of all five seasons.

"Certainly we do not want to put a premium on bad farming nor upon farming bad land. I think that if the cost of insurance is based, in considerable part, upon the loss experience of the specific farm, in each instance, it will tend to take care of that aspect. Then if some kind of a system of payments in kind is set up, it will tend to take care in part of the price problem. And if payment of the premiums can be conditioned to the good crop years, that will tend to take care not only of one great difficulty from the farmer's standpoint but it will help to iron out a surplus-shortage gyration that has bedeviled producers and markets since the beginning of this modern era.

"But, as I said a moment ago, I do not intend here to present a detailed proposal. The technical details of a crop insurance plan must come from the actuaries after they have studied the data long and carefully. What I do want is to get your minds taking stock of the proposition. Your reactions are of value and your help will be vital if this thing is to reach the stage of successful operation.

"On the broader question of national policy, it does seem probable to me that crop insurance is likely to fall within the range of permanent constructive measures. It will be too radical for the rugged individualist; it is too conservative for those who clamor for straight subsidies. For my part, I view it, in any event, as merely one more aid toward the goal, one more auxiliary to strengthen the general farm program.

"Crop insurance might well begin with only one crop—perhaps wheat. Producers of wheat appear to be the most eager to have it tried. But whatever is done about crop insurance in the immediate future, it cannot and is not expected to serve as a substitute for other programs."

RATE HEARING ORDERED

I. C. C. Denied Railroads' Petition to Allow Immediate Filing of Higher Tariffs

The Interstate Commerce Commission on November 19th decided that the petition of the railroads for modification of outstanding orders so as to extend permanently the freight rate surcharges expiring December 31st, with some changes, should not be granted at present. In order, however, to accord as prompt a hearing as possible on the issue, the Commission decided to reopen Ex Parte No. 115, the original surcharge proceedings, and set the initial hearing, to hear testimony from the railroads in support of their petition, for January 6, 1937, at Washington. Subsequent hearings will be announced later.

As the surcharges expire before the hearings start in the new proceedings, carriers may petition for another temporary extension of the surcharges until a final decision on the issue is reached.

In announcing its decision the Commission stated:

"About 300 replies to the petition have been received. Upon consideration of the petition and the replies the Commission has determined that the petition of the carriers, insofar as it prays for modification of outstanding orders to the extent necessary to permit the filing of rates described in Exhibit 2 attached to the petition, should not be granted at present upon the mere assertions of the petition and the replies thereto, but should be further heard before it is finally determined, for the following reasons: (1) The modification desired would amount to abrogation of the maintenance clauses of the orders, and it is believed that such action should not be taken except after interested parties have had a hearing upon the merits of the proposals of the rail carriers; (2) The expense to the carriers of publishing tariffs and supplements merely embodying the rate changes outlined in Exhibit 2 and the expense to the Commission of preparing and serving suspension orders relating to such rate changes would be very great and the labor involved might serve no useful end; and (3) The decision of the multitude of investigation and suspension proceedings within the maximum suspension period would impose an administrative burden which can be avoided by the course herein indicated.

"Treating the railroads' petition broadly, and as seeking ultimate approval as lawful of the specified new rates sought to be initiated, the Commission is of the view that the petitioners should be accorded as prompt a hearing as is possible on the issues so raised. It has therefore been decided to reopen Ex Parte No. 115 for further hearing as to the questions raised in the petition docketed as Ex Parte No. 118. The reopening of that proceeding has been decided upon in order to relieve carriers, shippers, and others who already have made extensive presentations in that proceeding from being required virtually to duplicate evidence of comparatively recent date. As an additional means of expediting the hearings any interested party will be permitted to submit relevant and material evidence in the form of a sworn statement, subject to the right of adverse parties to require the presence of affiant for the purpose of cross-examination based on such verified statements. This is substantially the procedure provided in rule 48 of the Rules in Equity to be followed in patent and trademark cases, and was the procedure followed in the Fifteen Per Cent Case, 1931, 191 I. C. C. 361."

REGULATIONS MODIFIED

Meat-Inspection Stamp on Dog and Cat Food Products Is Withdrawn

Withdrawal by the Bureau of Animal Industry of its meat-inspection stamp on dog food, cat food and similar products, to become effective September 15th, was announced in the INFORMATION LETTER for August 22nd. The Bureau on November 16th made further announcement of the modification of its regulations on these products, as follows:

"Recent developments in the commercial preparation of dog food, cat food, and similar products have caused the U. S. Bureau of Animal Industry to modify its regulations pertaining to these products. Designated as Amendment 10 to B. A. I. Order 211, the new requirements provide for the

withdrawal of the familiar meat-inspection stamp from containers of dog food and similar products. The new regulation provides, however, that containers of such products may bear the statement 'The meat or meat byproduct ingredient of this article has been examined and passed under Federal supervision. This article has been prepared in an establishment operating under Federal meat inspection.'

"The regulation, now in effect, also provides that the regular meat-inspection legend as used on food intended for human consumption may not be used on foods designated as being intended for dogs, cats, foxes, and similar animals. Thus the inspection legend 'U. S. Inspected and Passed by the Department of Agriculture' is reserved exclusively for foods intended for human consumption.

"The essential purpose of the new amendment is to inform the public that the meat ingredient has been inspected and passed but that inspection has not included various other ingredients with which the meat has been combined.

"The amendment further provides that when dog food or like articles are prepared in a part of a Federally inspected establishment, its sanitation shall receive the same supervision as other parts of the establishment.

"Details concerning the bureau's supervision of dog food and like products and their proper labeling are set forth in an official notice to supervising inspectors and proprietors and operators of establishments where such products are prepared. The Department of Agriculture also has arranged to receive reports to be used for statistical purposes relating to the commercial output of this class of product."

Prices of Farm Products Hold Steady

Prices of corn and hogs remained about the same from mid-October to mid-November, while slight advances in corn, cattle, lambs, potatoes, and eggs just about offset slight declines in wheat, poultry, butter, and cheese, according to the monthly summary of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. The general index of prices received by farmers for their products in mid-October stood at 121, compared with 124 for September and 109 for October last year.

Division of Industrial Economics Proposed

Department of Commerce officials have revealed their tentative plans for a proposed Division of Industrial Economics, appropriations for which are included in the estimates submitted by the Department to the Budget Bureau. The primary function of this division would be to get statistical data on business trends and the business cycle. This information would be derived from the surveys of inventories and sales by manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers, and studies of operation costs and distribution technique. The proposed division would have no regulatory functions.

U. S. Buying More Ham from Poland

Polish canned ham exports advanced from 18,643 quintals in the first half of 1935 to 48,089 quintals for the corresponding period of this year. Approximately 70 per cent of the exports were consigned to the United States, according to the American commercial attache at Warsaw. The increase, it is reported, is the result of a change in the Polish government policy, which now looks to the substitution of hog and meat products in place of grains in Poland's export trade.

Committee to Study Farm Tenancy

President Roosevelt has appointed a committee of 38 to report to him not later than February 1st on a "long term program of action to alleviate the shortcomings of our farm tenancy situation." As executive secretary and technical director for this committee he has named Dr. L. C. Gray, Assistant Administrator of the Resettlement Administration, in charge of the Land Utilization Division.

In a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, who is designated as chairman of the committee, the President urges that the committee consult with Senator Bankhead and Representative Jones, who were especially interested in this subject during the 74th Congress, and with other state and national leaders.

Frozen and Preserved Fruits in Cold Storage

The following table shows the holding of fruits in cold storage reported by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics as of November 1st, also a comparison with last year and with a five-year average:

	November 1, 1936	November 1, 1935	Five-year average
Apples:			
Barrels.....	326,000	979,000	1,265,000
Boxes.....	12,569,000	15,283,000	14,489,000
Bushels.....	11,585,000	12,607,000	10,353,000
Pears:			
Boxes—			
Bartletts.....	349,000	220,000	
Others.....	1,690,000	1,955,000	1,784,000
Baskets.....	99,000	86,000	208,000
Frozen and preserved fruits (pounds).....	90,496,000	86,602,000	80,964,000

Fruit and Vegetable Market Competition

Carlot Shipments as Reported by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture

	Week ending			Season total to	
	Nov. 14 1935	Nov. 14 1936	Nov. 7 1936	Nov. 14 1935	Nov. 14 1936
VEGETABLES					
Beans, snap and lima	277	303	278	10,731	9,277
Tomatoes.....	75	209	227	23,109	24,945
Green peas.....	70	162	134	7,416	7,607
Spinach.....	96	119	58	5,855	7,802
Others:					
Domestic, compet-					
ing directly....	2,318	2,794	3,144	94,786	107,166
Imports, compet-					
ing indirectly...	52	66	49	491	558
FRUITS					
Citrus, domestic....	2,299	3,172	2,410	7,793	11,865
Imports.....	4	1	2	326	94
Others, domestic....	869	1,269	1,776	48,794	46,570

British Columbia Salmon Pack Increases

The British Columbia salmon pack for the current season shows an appreciable increase over 1935, according to the American vice consul at Vancouver. As of October 31, 1936, the pack amounted to 1,804,181 cases compared with 1,484,862 cases for the corresponding period of last year. This year's pack of sockeye totaled 409,321 cases against 346,074 cases in 1935; chums, 538,203 cases against 384,907; pinks, 584,705 against 506,274; and coho, 208,518 against 210,908.

Trend of Chain Grocery Sales

Daily average sales of grocery chain stores for October showed an increase of about 3 per cent in dollar volume as compared with October, 1935, and were $8\frac{1}{2}$ per cent above the same month of 1934, according to preliminary estimates of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. Sales increased 2 per cent from September to October, or about the usual gain at this season, and average daily sales for the first ten months of the year were about 3 per cent above those for the corresponding period of 1935.

Fourth Section Relief Sought

The Interstate Commerce Commission announced on November 16th the receipt of an application requesting relief from the long-and-short-haul provision of Section 4 (1) of the Interstate Commerce Act in the shipment of canned foods from Michigan to points in the South. Any interested party desiring the Commission to hold a hearing upon the application should make a request in writing within 15 days from the date of the announcement.

Tin Plate Production in 1935

Production of tin plate in 1935, according to a preliminary statement issued by the Census Bureau, amounted to 3,789,159,497 pounds valued at \$175,730,008, as compared with 3,764,702,348 pounds valued at \$142,434,487 in 1933, an increase of 0.6 per cent in quantity and 23.4 per cent in value. As compared with 1929, the output in 1935 showed a decrease of 6 per cent in quantity and 9.5 per cent in value.

Of the 1935 production, 3,757,086,898 pounds valued at \$173,865,908 were coke plate, and 32,072,599 pounds valued at \$1,864,100 were charcoal plate.

Tin Plate Price

The base price for tin plate, according to press reports, has been changed to \$4.85 per box, Pittsburgh, and the discount of $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent has been eliminated. Accordingly the net price is virtually equivalent to the former price of \$5.25 per box with the $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent discount.

Report on Corn Borer Status Available

The relative abundance of the European corn borer in the fall of 1936, and its status this year in comparison with 1935, were determined from a survey conducted from August 10 to October 2 by the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine. The results are reported in supplement to No. 9 of volume 16 of the Insect Pest Survey Bulletin for November 15, 1936, just issued by the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

The survey involved examination of corn fields in 156 counties in Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, Vermont, Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland and Virginia. Thoroughly tested field methods, known to supply data adequate for comparisons between counties and county groups for one or more years, were employed. The information assembled is summarized in tables, maps and charts, supplemented by detailed discussion of conditions in each of the areas examined.

The Association's Bureau of Raw Products has arranged to obtain a small supply of this publication and will be glad to furnish copies to interested canners on request.

New Bulletin on "The Food Industry"

Under the title "The Food Industry" the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce has issued a 70-page mimeographed bulletin furnishing information concerning the historical background of the food and kindred products industry, statistics recording the present status and recent trends of the industry, channels of distribution of food products, sources of data of value to the industry, a bibliography of 200 food books and magazines, a list of 300 national and interstate trade associations in the food and kindred products industry, a trade association index and a partial list of 100 trade associations in the alcoholic beverages industry. Trends in retail and wholesale food prices through recent years are shown up to mid-1936.

Copies of the bulletin (Market Research Series No. 10.3) may be had at 10 cents each upon application to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

Survey of Canned Food Preferences

A survey of the food preferences of 5,000 families in 45 states, conducted by the research department of the *Farm Journal*, shows that 82 per cent of the families used canned fruit, 80 per cent canned vegetables, 80 per cent canned soup, 63 per cent tomato juice, 40 per cent strained vegetables, and 57 per cent canned milk.

Eleven brands of canned fruits, twelve of canned vegetables, ten of canned soup, eleven of tomato juice, eleven of strained vegetables, and twelve brands of canned milk were used as a basis for collecting this information.

The sampling was done by asking, "What brands of the following foods do you use?" In the published report of the survey the data are compiled by states, the states grouped by sections of the country—New England, Middle Atlantic, South, Southwest, Central, Mountain, Pacific. Totals for the United States, based on regional analyses, are given.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Old-age benefit taxes.....	5101
Convention room reservations.....	5101
Crop insurance.....	5103
Rate hearing ordered.....	5104
Regulations modified.....	5104
Prices of farm products hold steady.....	5105
Division of Industrial Economics proposed.....	5105
U. S. buying more ham from Poland.....	5105
Committee to study farm tenancy.....	5105
Frozen and preserved fruits in cold storage.....	5105
Fruit and vegetable market competition.....	5105
British Columbia salmon pack increases.....	5105
Trend of chain grocery sales.....	5106
Fourth section relief sought.....	5106
Tin plate production in 1935.....	5106
Tin plate price.....	5106
Report on corn borer status available.....	5106
New bulletin on "The Food Industry".....	5106
Survey of canned food preferences.....	5106